UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,514	04/04/2006	Heinrich Becker	MERCK-3044	4802
	7590 03/18/201 TE, ZELANO & BRA	EXAMINER		
2200 CLAREN	•	CROUSE, BRETT ALAN		
SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON,	VA 22201	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1794	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@mwzb.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/539,514	BECKER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Brett A. Crouse	1794		

	Brett A. Crouse	1794	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 26 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount on the period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed in the property of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed in the property of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b 	sideration and/or search (see NOT v); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed and the compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed and the claim(s).	See attached Notice of Non-Con	mpliant Amendment (l	·
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: 13-15. Claim(s) rejected: 1-11,13-15 and 17-30. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	κplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/D. Lawrence Tarazano/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794	/B. A. C./ Examiner, Art Unit 1794		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The claim amendment has introduced with respect to claims 13-15 a situation where the claims do not further limit the scope of the claim(s) from which they depend. Claims 13-15 are not limited to the 40 to 500 nm thickness as the upper value is not specified.

Applicant argues with respect to the references of record that Allen WO 99/32537 or Allen in view of Buechel US 2002/0179900 does not teach or suggest the claimed invention of the amended claims. Applicant also argues unexpected results have been established by the declaration of 5 October 2009. The examiner respectfully disagrees for the reasons below.

Allen teaches and claims the polymer comprising repeat units of formula (1) wherein the number of repeat units is unspecified in claim 1 and can be up to 500 in dependent claim 2. It is also noted with respect to layer thickness that Allen on page 12, lines 2-3 suggests that polymers of his invention can be deposited with a layer thickness less than 1 micron and less than 250 nanometers which overlaps the range of amended claim 1. Buechel additionally teaches that the range of 50 to 500 nanometers is known in the electroluminescent arts as a typical thickness range for polymeric charge transport materials.

Applicant also argues that the number repeat units of 35 or greater would not be obvious over Allen because of Allen's (PIDC) test data. It is noted that Allen's charge mobility data indicates that the higher molecular weight samples exhibit a similar charge mobility to the lower molecular weight samples.

Applicant also points to the declaration to establish unexpected results. The declaration only presents one inventive polymer, which is not commensurate in scope with the scope of the claims.